

**NRC Attributes, Potential Data Elements, Issues and Alternative**

Attribute and NRC Definition	Potential Data Elements for this Attribute	Issue Identified for this Attribute	Alternatives
<p><b>Potency</b> (page 95 NRC)  <i>Indicates power or strength: amount of a contaminant required to cause an adverse health effect. How much (dose) of a contaminant does it take to cause illness (adverse effect)?</i></p> <p><i>Potency of a pathogen may refer to the # of organisms required to cause disease, while potency of a chemical refers to the dose required to cause disease.</i></p> <p><i>NRC recommended plotting as a percentile of the contaminant's potency relative to the potencies of all contaminants being considered. The percentile (0-100) scale should then be converted to a decile (1 through 10) scale.</i></p>	<p><u>Non-carcinogens</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RfD (chronic and/or acute)</li> <li>• TDI, ADI, MRL, etc</li> <li>• NOAEL (highest)</li> <li>• NOEL (highest)</li> <li>• LOAEL (lowest) and description of relevant endpoint</li> <li>• BMDL (lowest)</li> <li>• LD 50 oral (lowest)</li> <li>• RfC (if no oral)</li> <li>• LEL??</li> </ul> <p><u>Carcinogens</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cancer slope factor</li> </ul> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative SARs</li> <li>• Uncertainty factors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to score non-carcinogens and carcinogens (NCAR and CAR) - for example data set - EPA used same definition as NAS and noted that the lower the critical dose/toxicity value the more toxic the contaminant.</li> <li>• Uncertainty factors would be applied to NOAEL, NOEL, LOAEL, BMDL, LD50 in order to make them comparable to risk-based value like the RfD.</li> <li>• Quality of the study should be considered</li> <li>• Need to determine how to select the program/programs for QSAR</li> <li>• Jamie noted that potency seems to run counter to scientific thinking - implies a level of exposure which is safe - while may apply to threshold chemicals - does not work for microbes and nonthreshold chemicals (genotypic carcinogens) - however, concept may be integrated with magnitude</li> </ul>	<p>For the example data set:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPA established a hierarchy for data elements with risk-based values having precedence over raw data and EPA assessment having a precedence over those of other agencies</li> <li>• EPA found that the decile distribution of potency values was not effective because the 92 percent of a test group of 171 chemicals would have received a score of 10 based on their RfD. Instead EPA/Cadmus used a logarithmic scale to assign the scores for potency. The logarithmic distribution for the test set of chemicals was close to normal</li> <li>• When cancer and noncancer effects could each be scored, EPA selected the higher potency score to represent the chemical.</li> </ul> <p>NOTES: Inherent difference exist between using a "threshold" or a derived risk based value in comparison to a toxic effects concentration. Perhaps the threshold value, if available could be considered a toxic effect level for the purposes of scoring attributes.</p> <p>Units may be an issue, and if ADI's are compared with RfD's then some accounting for the derivation process may be warranted.</p>

**NRC Attributes, Potential Data Elements, Issues and Alternative**

Attribute and NRC Definition	Potential Data Elements for this Attribute	Issue Identified for this Attribute	Alternatives
<p><b>Severity</b> (page 94 NRC)  <i>Degree to which a potential contaminant can cause an adverse health effect. (How bad is the effect?)</i></p> <p><i>Severity can be scored based on the anticipated clinical significance of the most sensitive health end point in affected individuals. NRC gave an example severity scale (page 96, Table 4.1)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical effect (associated with RfD or equivalent based on LOAEL)</li> <li>• Carcinogen classification                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPA</li> <li>• IARC</li> <li>• NTP</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>For example data set:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During scoring, tendency to consider effects at doses above the critical effect caused some bias</li> <li>• Noted that scoring requires expert judgment and depends on nature of effect (cancer, repr, dev, etc ).</li> <li>• Using EPA’s scoring scale, there were difficulties about how to score differences in organ and body weights.</li> <li>• If noncancer and cancer effect, used highest score to be conservative.</li> <li>• Need detailed description of critical effects.</li> <li>• Noted descriptions of critical effects data presented in IRIS were limited requiring assumptions or the desire to review IRIS files when scoring.</li> <li>• Need to develop an approach for chemicals that lack critical effect.</li> <li>• Need to expand descriptions and examples accompanying the scoring scale.</li> <li>• Note that raw data are qualitative/categorical, not numeric.</li> <li>• Inherent difference exists between severity of acute illness from pathogens and long term effects from chemicals. Temporal factors in severity will need to be discussed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition used by EPA for the example data set - the degree of biological impact on survival and quality of life; Developed an EPA alternative severity scale to NRC’s. Deleted chemical name (identity) to remove bias. (Should re-evaluate chemicals with their identity known to ensure scoring was appropriate).</li> <li>• Jamie suggests objective and transparent metric such as morbidity/mortality and frequency of different outcomes.</li> <li>• Use log (\$ willingness to pay to avoid the health endpoint).</li> </ul>

**NRC Attributes, Potential Data Elements, Issues and Alternative**

Attribute and NRC Definition	Potential Data Elements for this Attribute	Issue Identified for this Attribute	Alternatives
<p><b>Prevalence</b> (page 97 NRC)  <i>How commonly does or would a contaminant occur in drinking water?"</i></p> <p><i>Two dimensions - temporal and spatial.</i></p> <p><i>Temporal is the fraction of time that a contaminant is found at a given locale (NRC, page 97)</i></p> <p><i>Spatial is the proportion at locales in which the contaminant is found (NRC, page 97)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicators of size of water system or geographical area sampled if available</li> <li>• # or % of PWSs with detects</li> <li>• # or % sites with detects</li> <li>• # or % samples with detects</li> <li>• Water type (finished water, ambient, etc.)</li> <li>• Population served/% of population served with detects</li> <li>• Production/release/use data (quantity/year)</li> <li>• # Facilities using (??)</li> <li>• Release Medium</li> <li>• Temporal (spring, summer, fall winter)?</li> <li>• Location of sampling sites; regional or state</li> <li>• Location of discharge sites; regional or state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition and meaning of prevalence needs to be discussed and agreed upon.</li> <li>• Spatial data limited; Temporal data even more limited; so may not be able to plot as NRC suggested.</li> <li>• Need to define temporal and spatial as far as amount of data necessary to make a temporal or spatial determination.</li> <li>• Type and amount of data for contaminants will vary.</li> <li>• Detection limit varies and changes over time so affects % prevalence</li> <li>• Need to define "level of concern" - appears that NRC meant for occurrence but Jamie said need to relate "level of concern" to health effects. Some folks at EPA may prefer not to - this approach may really be magnitude?</li> <li>• May/may not need population data</li> <li>• Raw data processing issues; data from various sources and data quality</li> <li>• Is geographical distribution of locales where the substance was found national or localized?</li> <li>• Inorganic contaminants have a much greater prevalence than most organic chemical contaminants, and may need a separate scale</li> </ul>	<p>Example data set was data rich and had no temporal data - had to only use spatial data.</p> <p>Most important elements may be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # or % of sites with detections</li> <li>• # or % of samples at a site with detects.</li> <li>• Production release/use/data are secondary to finished or ambient water.</li> <li>• Use log (fraction of samples with positive result * median detection or reporting limit / RfD), replacing RfD by the corresponding cancer dose if a carcinogen.</li> </ul>

**NRC Attributes, Potential Data Elements, Issues and Alternative**

Attribute and NRC Definition	Potential Data Elements for this Attribute	Issue Identified for this Attribute	Alternatives
<p><b>Magnitude</b> (page 99 NRC)  <i>The concentration or expected concentration (e.g., based on chemical production) of a contaminant relative to a level that causes a perceived health effect. In other words, is the level high enough to cause harm? Not absolute magnitude but magnitude relative to potency.</i></p> <p><i>NRC suggested using the median water concentration as the concentration parameter for the potency scoring.</i></p> <p><i>NRC suggested using the square root <math>\sqrt{\text{Potency score} \times 1-10 \text{ decile rank for median occurrence}}</math></i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Median concentration detects</li> <li>• Mean concentration detects</li> <li>• Percentile concentration all data (25th, 50th, 75th, 90th, 95th, 99<sup>th</sup>)</li> <li>• Percentile concentration for all samples with detects (25th, 50th, 75th, 90th, 95th, 99th)</li> <li>• Median concentration all data</li> <li>• Maximum concentration all data</li> <li>• Mean concentration all data</li> <li>• Minimum concentration all data</li> <li>• Range of concentration</li> <li>• Amount released/year (to media) (TRI data)</li> <li>• Geographic distribution of releases</li> <li>• Potency score, if use NRC definition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to define meaning of magnitude since some are unclear about what NRC is suggesting that we use because the Square root <math>\sqrt{\text{Potency score} \times 1-10 \text{ decile rank for occurrence}}</math> does not appear to be a measure of concentration relative to potency. It is a product of concentration and potency</li> <li>• Using potency data as part of magnitude score may create an interdependence of variables, which could affect model results.</li> <li>• Must redefine magnitude if potency is not to be used as an element in the scoring.</li> <li>• Minimum concentration is likely to be a “Not Detect” in almost all cases.</li> <li>• Should use the same measure for concentration in the scoring rather than a mixture of mean/median, 95% and minimum reporting levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example data set only used concentration to establish the magnitude scores - If use this approach what is the best method to determine and score magnitude?</li> <li>• Should magnitude score be derived from the distribution of the ratio of the median concentration to potency as the definition implies?</li> <li>• Use log (mean or median concentration among detects)</li> </ul>

**NRC Attributes, Potential Data Elements, Issues and Alternative**

<b>Attribute and NRC Definition</b>	<b>Potential Data Elements for this Attribute</b>	<b>Issue Identified for this Attribute</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>
<p><b>Persistence/Mobility</b> (page 100 NRC)  <i>The likelihood that the contaminant would be found in the aquatic environment based solely on physical properties of the contaminant.</i></p> <p>NRC suggested scoring solubility and stability into high (3), medium (2) and low (1) depending on specified length of time for persistence and specified solubility in H<sub>2</sub>O. Then average the two scores and multiply by 10/3 to obtain score from 1-10.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stability (half-lives for hydrolysis, photolysis, biodegradation, aerobic soil, anaerobic soil)</li> <li>• Henry's Law constant</li> <li>• Kow, log Kow</li> <li>• Solubility product constant</li> <li>• Water solubility</li> <li>• Boiling point</li> <li>• log Koc</li> <li>• Melting point (?)</li> <li>• Vapor pressure</li>   <li>• Transformation data - metabolites, degradation products of concern ??</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some feel that pers/mob is really the lowest of the attributes (a default for lack of occurrence information).</li> <li>• Need a hierarchy for the selection and use of half life data.</li> <li>• When using temperature-related to physical property data, use the values for ambient temperatures.</li> <li>• Persistence/mobility could be important when using production/release data. Need to consider the stability of the contaminant in the environment and whether or not the contaminant moves from the site of release.</li> <li>• When persistence data indicate degradation of the contaminant, it is important to identify the degradates and insure that they are in the universe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use log (solubility, ug/L) + stability score + log (quantity manufactured * fraction released to environment) or something along this order.</li> </ul>